



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/807,975

03/24/2004

Alex Krister Raith

4740-193

4453

24112 7590 10/30/2007
COATS & BENNETT, PLLC
1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518

EXAMINER

RYMAN, DANIEL J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/807,975

Applicant(s)

RAITH ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel J. Ryman

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/6/06, 1/13/05, 10/8/04, 6/9/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: ref. 108 (see Fig. 2 and ¶ 0045)). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 24 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 24 recites: "at the second entity, selectively performing transcoding of multimedia content in the message and then returning the message to the first entity." Claim 22, which claim 24 depends upon, recites: "receiving the message back from the second entity at the first entity, after the second entity has subjected the message to selective transcoding of multimedia content in the message". It appears that the recitation of claim 24

fails to impose any additional limitation on the recitation of claim 22 since both recitations are directed to returning to a first entity a message that has been selectively transcoded by a second entity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-14 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term “default” in claims 1 and 26 is used by the claim to mean “a particular format specified for a particular destination address”, while the accepted meaning is “in the absence of,” Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary. Thus, the term “default” would be applied consistent with its accepted meaning if the default format was applied to a destination address when no other format was designated. Since the claims appear to require that the “default format” be specified for certain destination addresses, the term “default” is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term. For purposes of prior art rejections, Examiner will treat the “default format” to be any format specified by a destination address. Examiner notes that this interpretation does

Art Unit: 2616

not work in claims 14 and 26 since it would require a determination of the transcoding to be performed, and then require an additional determination of the transcoding to be performed, where this transcoding would have been determined in the previous determination step.

Therefore, Examiner will not make any prior art rejection for claims 14 and 26-30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-4, 9-13, 15, 16, 18-20, 22-25, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Trossen et al. (US 2004/0111476).

8. Regarding claims 1 and 31, Trossen discloses a method of and apparatus for processing multimedia messages outgoing from an originating network, the method comprising the steps of and the apparatus comprising means for: selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their destination network addresses (§ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and § [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information); and sending the messages according to their destination network addresses (§ [0029], where the message is sent to a user).

9. Regarding claim 2, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their

Art Unit: 2616

destination network addresses comprises performing transcoding for messages targeted to email addresses (§ [0002], where MMS allows the use of email, and § [0036], where “addressing information” is generically specified, such that it includes email addresses, see also §§ [0065]-[0067], where an exemplary rules database performs certain functions based on email addresses).

10. Regarding claim 3, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their destination network addresses comprises not performing transcoding for messages not targeted to email addresses (§ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and § [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information, such that users can specify not to perform transcoding on messages not targeted to email addresses).

11. Regarding claim 4, Trossen discloses selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into one or more specified formats as a function of their destination network addresses (§ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and § [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information).

12. Regarding claim 9, Trossen discloses that the originating network comprises a first wireless communication network (Fig. 2 and §§ [0025]-[0027], where the originating network is wireless communication network, ref. 212), and wherein sending the messages according to their destination network addresses comprises sending the messages from one or more Multimedia Messaging Services (MMS) servers in the first wireless communication network (Fig. 2 and §§ [0025]-[0027], where the messages are send from MMS, ref. 214, in the originating network).

13. Regarding claim 10, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into a default format as a function of their destination network addresses comprises performing default transcoding for outgoing messages targeted to Internet domains and not performing default transcoding for outgoing messages targeted to wireless network domains (¶ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and ¶ [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information, such that the rules can be set in a manner in which “default transcoding” is performed for messages destined to IP domains and no “default transcoding” is performed for messages destined for wireless networks, see also ¶¶ [0046]-[0047]).

14. Regarding claim 11, Trossen discloses for outgoing messages targeted to wireless network domains, determining whether transcoding is desired for a particular outgoing message targeted to a particular wireless network domain, and, if so, transcoding at least a portion of the multimedia content in that message into a format specified for that particular wireless network domain (¶ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and ¶ [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information, see also ¶¶ [0046]-[0047]).

15. Regarding claim 12, Trossen discloses that determining whether transcoding is desired for a particular outgoing message targeted to a particular wireless network domain comprises determining whether a database identifies that particular network as one for which transcoding is desired (¶¶ [0046]-[0047], where a network rule is checked to see if transcoding is required for a particular network, see also ¶¶ [0034],[0036]).

Art Unit: 2616

16. Regarding claim 13, Trossen discloses identifying from information stored in the database the format specified for that particular network (§§ [0046]-[0047], where a network rule is checked to see if transcoding is required for a particular network, see also §§ [0034],[0036]).

17. Regarding claims 15 and 32, Trossen discloses a method of and apparatus for processing multimedia messages outgoing from an originating network, the method comprising the steps of and the apparatus comprising means for: sending destination address information for an outgoing multimedia message from a first entity to a second entity (§ [0023], where the user databases, i.e. a second entity, store the rules, and § [0036], where the rules are stored according to address, such that to obtain a rule the processing element (the MMS server or rule processor as taught in § [0024]), i.e. the first entity, would have to retrieve the rule from the user database, see also § [0060], where the rule processor determines “whether any stored recipient rules are associated with the recipient of the [message]”); receiving at the first entity a corresponding indication from the second entity as to whether multimedia content transcoding is desired for the message (§ [0023], where the processing element, i.e. the first entity, will receive the rule from the user database, i.e. the second entity, and § [0034], where the rules deal with transcoding, see also § [0060]); selectively performing transcoding at the first entity based on the indication (§ [0060], where the rule processor performs the transcoding, see also § [0034]); and sending the message from the first entity for delivery to the destination address (§ [0029], where the message is sent to a user, and § [0024], where the rules may be executed by the MMS server, which is also the device that transmits the message to the user).

Art Unit: 2616

18. Regarding claim 16, Trossen discloses that the second entity is external to the originating network (Fig. 2, where the originating network is ref. 212 and the database is stored in ref. 220, i.e. the database storing the rules is in the destination network, see also ¶ [0059]).

19. Regarding claim 18, Trossen discloses that the originating network comprises a first wireless communication network (Fig. 2 and ¶¶ [0025]-[0027], where the originating network is wireless communication network, ref. 212), and wherein sending destination address information for an outgoing multimedia message from a first entity to a second entity comprises sending an indication of a destination mobile telephone number targeted by the message (¶ [0036], where the rules are stored according to destination address, such as a telephone number).

20. Regarding claim 19, Trossen discloses receiving from the first entity a corresponding indication from the second entity as to whether multimedia content transcoding is desired for the message comprises receiving an indication from the second entity that identifies a desired format for transcoding at least a portion of the multimedia content in the message (¶ [0034], where it is implicit that the rule stores the desired format for the transcoding).

21. Regarding claim 20, Trossen discloses that selectively performing transcoding at the first entity based on the indication comprises determining whether the corresponding indication returned by the second entity indicates that transcoding is desired and, if so, transcoding at least a portion of the multimedia content in the message into the desired format (¶ [0034], where the message is transcoded if the rule dictates that transcoding is desired).

22. Regarding claims 22 and 33, Trossen discloses a method of and apparatus for processing multimedia messages outgoing from an originating network, the method comprising the steps of and the apparatus comprising means for: forwarding an outgoing multimedia message from a

Art Unit: 2616

first entity to a second entity (¶ [0059], where the MMS server, i.e. the first entity, passes a received message to a rule processor, i.e. a second entity); receiving the message back from the second entity at the first entity, after the second entity has subjected the message to selective transcoding of multimedia content in the message (¶ [0059], where the MMS server, i.e. the first entity, receives the message back from the rule processor, i.e. a second entity, after the rule processor has executed rules, and ¶ [0061], where the rules include transcoding, see also ¶¶ [0034],[0036]); and sending the message from the first entity for delivery to the destination address (¶ [0059], where the MMS server, i.e. the first entity, delivers the message content).

23. Regarding claim 23, Trossen discloses that the second entity is external to the originating network (Fig. 2, where the originating network is ref. 212 and the database is stored in ref. 220, i.e. the database storing the rules is in the destination network, see also ¶ [0059]).

24. Regarding claim 24, Trossen discloses, at the second entity, selectively performing transcoding of multimedia content in the message and then returning the message to the first entity (¶ [0059], where the MMS server, i.e. the first entity, receives the message back from the rule processor, i.e. a second entity, after the rule processor has executed rules, and ¶ [0061], where the rules include transcoding, see also ¶¶ [0034],[0036]).

25. Regarding claim 25, Trossen discloses that selectively performing transcoding of multimedia content in the message comprises determining whether transcoding is desired for the message based on a destination address of the message and, if transcoding is desired, transcoding at least a portion of multimedia content in the message from a first coding format into a second coding format (¶ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media

Art Unit: 2616

content is transcoded”, and ¶ [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. Claims 5-8, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trossen et al. (US 2004/0111476).

28. Regarding claim 5, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into one or more specified formats as a function of their destination network addresses comprises determining that an outgoing message is targeted to a particular address, and transcoding at least a portion of the multimedia content in the message into a format specified for the targeted address (¶ [0034], where “one or more recipient rules can be defined such that the media content is transcoded”, and ¶ [0036], where the recipient rules can be associated with the respective recipients based on addressing information).

Trossen does not expressly disclose that the particular address is related to a particular wireless network domain. However, Trossen does disclose specifying a particular type of message be delivered over a particular type of network (¶ [0046], where a rule can be defined that requires media content to be delivered over a given type of network, and where the networks are wireless networks), where the type of network may require a specific format for delivery (¶ [0047], where the network may require transcoding). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2616

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine that an outgoing message is targeted to a particular wireless network domain and transcoding at least a portion of the content in the message into a format specified for the targeted wireless network domain to ensure that the message is delivered over a given network in a format appropriate for that network.

29. Regarding claim 6, Trossen discloses that determining that an outgoing message is targeted to a wireless network domain comprises identifying a targeted mobile telephone number for the outgoing message (§ [0036], where addresses can be telephone numbers) and identifying a name of the wireless network domain based on accessing an ENUM database that associates mobile station telephone numbers with particular wireless network domains (§ [0046], where the rules database, i.e. an ENUM database, implicitly associates the telephone number with particular domains, e.g. 2G mobile networks or 3G mobile networks, since the type of network is identifies based on the incoming message, which includes destination telephone number).

30. Regarding claim 7, Trossen discloses that selectively transcoding multimedia content in outgoing multimedia messages from a current format into one or more specified formats as a function of their destination network addresses comprises transcoding audio content in the outgoing message from a first audio coding format associated with the originating communication network into a second audio coding format specified for the targeted wireless network domain (§§ [0046]-[0047], where a rule can be defined that requires media content to be transcoded before delivery over a given type of network).

31. Regarding claim 8, Trossen does not expressly disclose that the originating network comprises either a GSM wireless communication network, or a cdma2000 wireless communication network, and the targeted wireless network domain corresponds either to a GSM

Art Unit: 2616

wireless communication network, or to a cdma2000 wireless communication network. However, Trossen does disclose that the originating network is a 2G mobile network or a 3G mobile network and that the destination network is a 2G mobile network or a 3G mobile network (§ [0046]). Examiner takes official notice that GSM is a well-known 2G wireless communication protocol and that cdma2000 is a well known 3G wireless communication protocol. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the originating network comprise either a GSM wireless communication network, or a cdma2000 wireless communication network, and the targeted wireless network domain corresponds either to a GSM wireless communication network, or to a cdma2000 wireless communication network to increase the industrial applicability of Trossen's system by allowing it to operate over commonly used wireless communication protocols.

32. Regarding claim 17, Trossen does not expressly disclose that sending destination address information for an outgoing multimedia message from a first entity to a second entity comprises forwarding the message from the first entity to the second entity, and wherein the message includes the destination address information. However, Trossen does disclose sending the entire message to a second entity when the entity processes the message (§ [0059]). Trossen also discloses that the rules may be retrieved according to any of a number of manners (§ [0036]), such that rules may be retrieved based on more information than just the destination address information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send to the second entity the entire message to allow the second entity to retrieve from the message the pertinent information needed to retrieve the pertinent rule.

Art Unit: 2616

33. Regarding claim 21, Trossen does not expressly disclose that sending the message from the first entity for delivery to the destination address comprises sending the message to a multimedia server in a destination network for subsequent delivery to a targeted recipient. However, Trossen does disclose that a first MMS server in an originating network will send the message to a second MMS server in a destination network (§§ [0056]-[0059]). Trossen also discloses that the rules may be used to provide more efficient communication over a network (§ [0045]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the message to a multimedia server in a destination network for subsequent delivery to a targeted recipient to enable the message to be delivered in a manner in which efficient communication can be utilized over the network connecting the originating and destination multimedia servers.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sevanto et al. (USPN 6,848,008), see entire document which pertains to selective transcoding.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (571)272-3152. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571)272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daniel J. Ryman
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

Daniel Ryman